LOLITA PENNINGTON V. SHARANJIT PARMAR, ET AL. Ralph D. Scott on 01/09/2018

Page 1

| | 1450 | |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | _ |
| 2 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI | |
| 3 | OXFORD DIVISION | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | LOLITA PENNINGTON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS | |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESTATE AND WRONGFUL | |
| 7 | DEATH BENEFICIARIES OF ANDRIANA HALL PLAINTIFFS | |
| 8 | V. CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:16cv248-NBB-JMV | |
| 9 | SHARANJIT PARMAR, PARMAR TRUCKLINES, | |
| 10 | UPS GROUND FREIGHT, INC. A/K/A | |
| 11 | UNITED PARCEL SERVICE DEFENDANTS | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | VIDEO DEPOSITION OF DR. RALPH D. SCOTT | |
| 15 | Held on Tuesday, January 9, 2018, at 10:13 a.m., in the | |
| 16 | offices of Bridgforth & Buntin, PLLC, 5293 Getwell Road, | |
| 17 | Southaven, Mississippi, at the instance of the Defendant, UPS | |
| 18 | Ground Freight, Inc., a/k/a United Parcel Service | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | Appearances Noted Herein | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Reported by: Karen C. Popernik, MS CCR 1276, TN LCR 469 | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | Huseby File No. 189006 | |
| | | |

www.huseby.com Huseby, Inc. Regional Centers 800-333-2082 Charlotte ~ Atlanta ~ Washington, DC ~ New York ~ Houston ~ San Francisco



LOLITA PENNINGTON V. SHARANJIT PARMAR, ET AL. Ralph D. Scott on 01/09/2018

Page 2

| T. | |
|----|---|
| 1 | APPEARANCES: |
| 2 | REPRESENTING THE PLAINTIFFS: |
| 3 | TAYLOR BUNTIN, ESQUIRE |
| 4 | Bridgforth & Buntin, PLLC |
| 5 | 5293 Getwell Road |
| 6 | Southaven, Mississippi 38672 |
| 7 | 662.393.4450 |
| 8 | Taylor@bridgforthbuntin.com |
| 9 | |
| 10 | REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT, UPS GROUND FREIGHT, INC., A/K/A |
| 11 | UNITED PARCEL SERVICE: |
| 12 | RONNA D. KINSELLA, ESQUIRE |
| 13 | Glassman, Wyatt, Tuttle & Cox, P.C. |
| 14 | 26 North Second Street |
| 15 | Memphis, Tennessee 38103 |
| 16 | 901.527.4673 |
| 17 | Rkinsella@gwtclaw.com |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

LOLITA PENNINGTON V. SHARANJIT PARMAR, ET AL. Ralph D. Scott on 01/09/2018

Pages 22..25

| - | | | 1 ages 222 |
|----|--|----|--|
| | Page 2 material that did not impact my opinion, which was why it was | | Page 24 1 with respect to the Rust documents that have all the |
| - | 2 not attached to my report as an exhibit. | | 2 transcripts. There is a time dimension as to when I actually |
| | Q. Okay. So the W-2s were not attached because they | | 3 started my computations. And if you will look at my tables |
| 1 | 4 didn't really affect your opinion. | | 4 okay |
| | 5 A. That's correct. | 1 | Q. The ones attached to the report? |
| | Q. Okay. All right. I'm going to mark the W-2s, then, | | A. These are attached. Yes. This is part of Exhibit A. |
| | 7 as the collective exhibit. That will be Exhibit I. | | 7 You can see that I didn't run any earning capacity for |
| | 8 (2015 AND 2016 W-2 INFORMATION MARKED AS | | |
| | 9 EXHIBIT I.) | وا | _ |
| 1 | Q. Okay. All right. I just want to run through these | 10 | |
| 1 | l briefly. I don't know that I'm going to mark all of these as | 11 | |
| 1 | 2 exhibits. | 12 | |
| 1 | In your file, looks like there is a letter | 13 | |
| 1 | 4 enclosing documents that were received from Rust College. Is | 14 | ** * |
| 1 | | 15 | 5 |
| 1 | 6 A. Yes. | 16 | TO MADE AND THE PARTY OF THE PA |
| 1 | Q. And who is that letter from? | 17 | |
| 1 | 8 A. Taylor Buntin, Stewart Matthews and well and | 18 | |
| 15 | _ | 19 | |
| 2 | - | 20 | |
| 2 | | 21 | *2 |
| 2: | A. I think this and there are not. I think probably | 22 | |
| 23 | | 23 | Q. Okay. |
| 24 | | 24 | A. And I think my narrative basically makes it clear as |
| 25 | | 25 | |
| - | | | |
| 1 | Page 23 A. And you know that since the Plaintiff's counsel | 1 | Q. Okay. All right. |
| 2 | | 2 | A. I hope that's not confusing. |
| 3 | | 3 | Q. No. I understand perfectly. |
| 4 | | 4 | All right. So, then, going back to your file |
| 5 | A. And everything that I might or might not have | 5 | materials again, it looks like there are and I'm not going |
| 6 | | 6 | to go into all of these, but there is a series of media |
| 7 | Q. Okay. | 7 | articles or media blogs about the accident. Correct? |
| 8 | A. So this is just one of those documents. | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Okay. | 9 | Q. Okay. Let me get to the bottom of these here. And |
| 10 | A. I think I printed it as being indicative that that | 10 | were these documents that you pulled or were these documents |
| 11 | | 11 | that were provided to you by the Plaintiff? |
| 12 | think the transcripts are contained in there later, too. | 12 | A. So so they were provided by the Plaintiff. |
| 13 | | 13 | Q. Okay. |
| 14 | A. Looks to me like this is a cover letter for those | 14 | A. They were included in those drop box items that we'll |
| 15 | transcripts. | 15 | continue to say were dumped because it was a bunch of documents |
| 16 | Q. And this may short circuit a little bit, but in going | 16 | dumped on me as well. As I started wading through those |
| 17 | to what you actually used and relied upon in support of the | 17 | documents preliminarily, I printed out some things just that I |
| 18 | opinions contained in your report, the documents like this and | 18 | thought might be useful to me at some point. And there is some |
| 19 | the ones that you said and I'm going to use your term so | 19 | factual information in those newspaper accounts that I thought |
| 20 | don't I don't want Plaintiff's counsel to get mad at me | 20 | could be useful. And possibly I pulled some dates out of |
| 21 | that Plaintiff's counsel dumped on us, those documents, if they | 21 | there. |
| 22 | weren't actually included in your report, is it safe for me to | 22 | Q. Okay. You mentioned some that you okay. Let |
| 23 | assume that you did not rely upon those documents in support of | | me back up. That was a bad start to a question. I apologize. |
| 24 | your opinions? | | I think I heard you just say that you pulled some factual |
| 25 | A. Yeah. Well, let me be careful with one thing there | | information out of these articles that you thought might be |
| | 3 | | I and Joe dividite indite be |

LOLITA PENNINGTON V. SHARANJIT PARMAR, ET AL.

| | Ralph D. Sco | tt c | on 01/09/2018 Pages 2629 |
|-----|--|------|--|
| , | Page 2 | | Page 28 |
| | | | 1 Q. And, then, Dr. Scott, it looks like the last thing in |
| 3 | get and the state of action, and the | | 2 here appears to be a copy of what purports to be the First |
| 4 | 1 THE STATE OF STATE | | 3 Amended Complaint in this case. Is that correct? |
| 9 | | - | 4 A. Yes. |
| 12 | 2. 51112 | ! | 9. And you do understand that that First Amended |
| 7 | Compacación ciac faccor | | 6 Complaint is not actually part of this case. Correct? |
| ĺ | | - 1 | 7 A. I don't. |
| ' | 2. Providently as to retuces to chese articles, | 1 8 | L. and the special control and the state of the special specia |
| 9 | The parties and the county, to chere dity - and | 9 | part of your file materials? |
| 10 | 2 2 The proof of ballon, In the Co | 10 | printed all out just |
| 111 | 1 3 Francis of property of pay you we relied | 11 | with the thought that it might contain some underlying factual |
| 12 | The state of the s | 12 | |
| 13 | 2 | 13 | a special inclination that |
| 14 | and the problem dates date I putted out of | 14 | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i |
| 15 | Part of the state | 15 | The state of the s |
| 16 | 1 | 16 | actually used in either creating or supporting your opinions in |
| 17 | Q. Okay. Well, then, we'll skip over the rest of that. | 17 | this case? |
| 18 | t the the the the the the | 18 | A. (Reviews.) So I think some of the factual things |
| 19 | 2, | 19 | would have factored in. For example, here's the date of death |
| 20 | Q. Okay. | 20 | that I definitely factored into my analysis. I can't tell you |
| 21 | A assumed into my opinion. | 21 | if I got it from here or the newspaper. I had to have that |
| 22 | Q. Okay. And then, I think, this was the next set of | 22 | information so it is contained in the Complaint. (Reviews.) |
| 23 | to be about about the first was contage made we | 23 | I don't think there's anything else in there. |
| 24 | - The state of the | 24 | Q. Okay. All right. Okay. I'm going to give you what |
| 25 | Mississippi Community College transcript. These are in here. | 25 | is left right now of your file materials back. |
| _ | Page 27 | 1 | Page 29 |
| | Correct? | 1 | A. Okay. |
| 2 | A. Yes. | 2 | Q. And let me separate this out. |
| 3 | Q. Okay. | 3 | Okay. Dr. Scott, I'm going to hand you the |
| 4 | A. And there actually is a Rust application that may | 4 | deposition notice in this case. |
| 5 | that may be where I got the dates. | 5 | BY MS. KINSKLLA: And, Mr. Buntin, if you would |
| 6 | Q. Okay. | 6 | like to take a look at it |
| 7 | A. I'm not sure where I got the dates. | 7 | BY MR. BUNTIN: I've got one. |
| 8 | Q. So we have some of the transcripts, it looks like. | Ð | BY MS. KINSELLA: Okay. |
| 9 | Okay. All right. From these specific documents | 9 | Q. Have you seen this Notice of Deposition before? |
| 10 | that you pulled out for Rust College, is that and correct me | 10 | A. I have. |
| | if I'm wrong. Is that all the documents that you received from | 11 | Q. Okay. If you flip over to where it looks like Page |
| 12 | the Plaintiff related to the Plaintiff's collegiate history? | 12 | really the start of Page 4, there's an Exhibit A |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | unfortunately, we are back to letters again |
| 14 | Q. Okay. And were those documents relied upon by you in | 14 | A. Yes. |
| | support of your opinions in this case | 15 | Q attached to this deposition notice. |
| 16 | A. Only | 16 | A. Yeah, |
| 17 | Q beyond what we've talked about? | 17 | Q. Did you review this Exhibit A before your deposition |
| 18 | A. Yeah. I don't think beyond what we've already talked | 18 | today? |
| | about. | 19 | A. I really did not spend much time with this, primarily |
| 20 | Q. Okay. All right. I am going to go ahead and make | 20 | because I thought that I had already provided all of the |
| | since you pulled these out for me, I'm going to go ahead and | 21 | required Rule 26 stuff, plus I knew I was going to bring my |
| | make these documents with the cover letter from Rust College as | | whole file with me. |
| | the next collective exhibit. It looks like it will be | 23 | Q. Okay. All right. I want to run through these with |
| 24 | collective Exhibit J. | 24 | was just real fact and make mure |

24 you just real fast and make sure --

25 A. Sure.

(COLLEGE TRANSCRIPTS MARKED AS EXHIBIT J.)

25

LOLITA PENNINGTON V. SHARANJIT PARMAR, ET AL. Ralph D. Scott on 01/09/2018

Page 41

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER |
|----|---|
| 2 | I, KAREN CARNELL POPERNIK, MS CCR 1276, |
| 3 | TN LCR 469, Notary Public commissioned by the State of |
| 4 | Mississippi, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, and |
| 5 | including this page, contain a true and correct transcript of |
| 6 | the testimony of the witness, DR. RALPH D. SCOTT, as taken by |
| 7 | me at the time and place heretofore stated, and later reduced |
| 8 | to typewritten form to the best of my skill and ability; that I |
| 9 | placed the witness under oath to truthfully answer all |
| 10 | questions in this matter by the authority vested in me by the |
| 11 | State of Mississippi and the State of Tennessee; that the |
| 12 | signature of the witness was expressly waived; and that I am |
| 13 | not in the employ of, or related to, any counsel or party in |
| 14 | this matter, and have no interest, monetary or otherwise, in |
| 15 | the final outcome of the proceeding. |
| 16 | Witness my signature and seal on this the 9th day of |
| 17 | January, 2018. |
| 18 | Karen Carrier Reparit |
| 19 | |
| 20 | KAREN CARNELL POPERNIK, |
| 21 | MS CCR 1276, TN LCR 469 |
| 22 | My Commission Expires: 3/5/20 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| _ | |